



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/702,289	10/30/2000	Eva Chen	TRNDP004	1429
22434	7590	04/10/2008	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER LLP			KHOSHNOODI, NADIA	
P.O. BOX 70250				
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2137	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/702,289	CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NADIA KHOSHNOODI	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 October 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/7/2007 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments/amendments with respect to amended claims 1 & 12, previously presented claims 2-11 & 13-26 filed 11/7/2007 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Response to Arguments

Applicants contend that Bates fails to teach or suggest "a scan log which is sent back to at least one of the first anti-virus scanning server and the second anti-virus scanning server over said distributed computer network from each client user detailing specific results of the scanning on each client end-user computer by said antivirus scanning program." Applicants further contend that Bates fails to teach or suggest "generating a scan log from each scanned client end-user computer and sending the scan log back from each client over said distributed computer network, the scan log detailing specific results of the scanning program on each client end-user computer." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Bates teaches downloading (to the client computer) a client copy of a virus checker program (from one of the various vendors chosen),

where the downloading step is followed by executing that antivirus program on the client's computer (col. 11, lines 17-25). Once the scanning process has completed, a log of information detailing any viruses that may have been found, or a message conveying that no virus has been found, i.e. specific results, is sent back to the server where the details are stored (col. 11, lines 25-38). Thus, Bates teaches a scan log which is sent back to at least one of the first anti-virus scanning server and the second anti-virus scanning server over said distributed computer network from each client user detailing specific results of the scanning on each client end-user computer by said antivirus scanning program and generating a scan log from each scanned client end-user computer and sending the scan log back from each client over said distributed computer network, the scan log detailing specific results of the scanning program on each client end-user computer.

Due to the reasons stated above, the Examiner maintains rejections with respect to the pending claims. The prior arts of records taken singly and/or in combination teach the limitations that the Applicant suggests distinguish from the prior art. Therefore, it is the Examiner's conclusion that the pending claims are not patentably distinct or non-obvious over the prior art of record as presented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

I. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

II. Claims 1-7, 9, 11-18, 20, and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates et al., United States Patent No. 6,785,732 and further in view of Hill et al., United States Patent No. 6,088,804.

As per claims 1 and 12:

Bates et al. substantially teach a system/method comprising: a plurality of client users having potentially infected client end-user computers, said end-user computers being distributed over said distributed computer network (col. 3, lines 41-50); a first anti-virus scanning server executing from a first vendor and a second antivirus scanning server executing software from a second vendor, each accessible via the distributed computer network, said first anti-virus scanning server and said second anti-virus scanning server each including an anti-virus scanning program, whereby the client users contact the first scanning server or the second scanning server to facilitate virus scanning of the client end-user computers by downloading said anti-virus scanning program (col. 8, line 45 – col. 9, line 11 and Fig. 6); a scan log which is sent back to at least one of the first anti-virus scanning server and the second anti-virus scanning server over said distributed computer network from each client user detailing specific results of the virus scanning on each client end-user computer by said antivirus scanning program (col. 8, lines 11-15); a virus-tracking server for receiving the scan log information from said client end-user computers via the first anti-virus scanning server from the first vendor and the second anti-virus scanning server from the second vendor (col. 6, lines 4-20 and col. 9, lines 47-60); a database server associated with the virus-checking server for processing the scan log information into virus-tracking information (col. 6, lines 4-20 and col. 9, lines 47-60); and a tracking user from the virus tracking server (col. 11, lines 39-67).

Not explicitly disclosed is wherein the scan log information is received by the virus-tracking server in real time and at least one virus-tracking display mode accessible by a tracking user, the display mode providing real-time updates of said virus-tracking information pertaining to the scan logs, wherein the anti-virus scanning program residing at the client end-user computers generates one or more maps displaying the real-time updates, and wherein the one or more maps are generated and displayed at the client end-user computers. However, Hill et al. teach displaying in real-time, to an administrator of some type, graphs of virus detection incidents in various geographical sub-regions in order to keep track of potential viruses that may spread and damage other systems if no action is taken (col. 3, lines 36-41). Hill et al. further teach that each of the agents who provide the information recorded and displayed in the graph may also view the graph so that they are aware of how quickly and in what sub-regions a virus/attack is spreading (col. 8, line 59 – col. 9, line 25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system disclosed in Bates et al. to have a displaying mechanism that is updated in real-time in order to ensure early detection of possible viral threats. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since Hill et al. suggest that displaying the possible threats in a manner that allows quick interpretation of the situation is imperative in minimizing the impact that the virus may have on the network as a whole in col. 7, lines 3-17 and col. 9, lines 17-19.

As per claims 2 and 13:

Bates et al. and Hill et al. substantially teach the system/method of claims 1 and 12. Furthermore, Hill et al. teach wherein the tracking user can configure the display modes to show

the virus-tracking information in association with user-selected geographic maps of where the viruses are occurring (col. 3, lines 36-41).

As per claims 3 and 14:

Bates et al. and Hill et al. substantially teach the system/method of claims 1 and 12.

Furthermore, Hill et al. teach wherein display modes include a plurality of web pages with user selectable menus to configure the virus-tracking display on the pages (col. 9, lines 20-25).

As per claims 4 and 15:

Bates et al. and Hill et al. substantially teach the system/method of claims 1 and 12.

Furthermore, Bates et al. teach a scan log contains no information relating to the direct identification of the client user (col. 12, lines 41-45).

As per claims 5 and 16:

Bates et al. and Hill et al. substantially teach the system/method of claims 1 and 12.

Furthermore, Hill et al. teach that the scan log includes the name of the virus, the frequency of its occurrence, and the geographic location of the infected computer (col. 8, lines 23-35).

As per claims 6 and 17:

Bates et al. and Hill et al. substantially teach the system/method of claims 1 and 12.

Furthermore, Bates et al. teach a servlet program on the virus-tracking server is used to receive the scan log information from the at least one anti-virus scanning server (col. 8, line 45 – col. 9, line 11).

As per claims 7 and 18:

Bates et al. and Hill et al. substantially teach the system/method of claims 1 and 12.

Furthermore, Bates et al. teach a polling program is used to regularly retrieve virus-tracking

information from the database server and store it in a data object (col. 12, lines 37-58).

As per claims 9 and 20:

Bates et al. and Hill et al. substantially teach the system/method of claims 1 and 12.

Furthermore, Hill et al. teach a Java applet running on tracking user browser is used to display a real-time virus-tracing map (col. 6, lines 45-67).

As per claims 11 and 22:

Bates et al. and Hill et al. substantially teach the system/method of claims 1 and 12.

Furthermore, Bates et al. teach the system wherein the distributed computer network includes the Internet, wherein said scan log from each scanned client computer is sent back over the Internet to be received by said virus tracking server (col. 8, line 45 – col. 9, line 11). Yet further, Hill et al. teach wherein said virus tracking display mode is accessible over the Internet by said tracking user (col. 8, lines 7-16).

As per claims 23 and 25:

Bates et al. and Hill et al. substantially teach the system/method of claims 1 and 12.

Furthermore, Hill et al. teach wherein said virus-tracking information identifies concentrations of a computer virus at said client end-user computer locations (col. 8, lines 23-35).

As per claims 24 and 26:

Bates et al. and Hill et al. substantially teach the system/method of claims 1 and 12.

Furthermore, Bates et al. teach wherein said scan log information is processed by aggregating said scan logs from each client end-user computer and then synthesizing said virus tracking information (col. 6, lines 6-20)

III. Claims 8, 10, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates et al., United States Patent No. 6,785,732 and Hill et al., United States Patent No. 6,088,804 as applied to claims 1, 7, 12, and 18 above, and further in view of Trcka et al., United States Patent No. 6,453,345

As per claims 8 and 19:

Bates et al. and Hill et al. substantially teach the system/method of claims 7 and 18. Not explicitly disclosed is a common gateway interface program used to retrieve the data object for display by the tracking user. Trcka et al. teach traffic capture components, which run continuously in the background, to passively generate a data stream that represents the traffic present on the network (col. 10, lines 60-66). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Bates et al.'s collaborative server by reporting and logging information about viruses tracking for the client user in order that the client may utilize the information to deploy anti-virus programs.

As per claims 10 and 21:

Bates et al. and Hill et al. substantially teach the system/method of claims 1 and 12. Not explicitly disclosed is wherein the client user is also the tracking user. Trcka et al. teach from the screens, the user can specify such parameters as start time/date, end time/date, the types of events of interest. The user can specify search criteria and specific fields to be searched and can specify an output type of the display screen, the printer, or the file (col. 20, lines 5-12). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Bates et al.'s collaborative server by allowing the client user to also be the user, thus

allowing individuals to set-up web sights and protect their computer from viruses by use of the allowed operations.

**References Cited, Not Used*

The prior art, US Patent No. 6,721,721, made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US Patent No. 6,721,721 has been cited because it is relevant to the displaying/virus tracking portions of the claimed invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nadia Khoshnoodi whose telephone number is (571) 272-3825. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nadia Khoshnoodi/
Examiner, Art Unit 2137
4/8/2008

NK

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2137